UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,141	12/30/2003	John D. Mata	127P105USU1	3840
23322 IPLM GROUP,	7590 07/16/200 P.A.	8	EXAMINER	
POST OFFICE	BOX 18455		NGUYEN, DINH Q	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3752	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/749,141	MATA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dinh Q. Nguyen	3752
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 / 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is FINAL . 3) Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-17 are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documer application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Art Unit: 3752

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Upon further detail review of the claims and the invention, the Examiner is hereby withdrawn and apologized for the previous Election/Restrictions requirement dated February 20, 2008, and issuing the Election/Restrictions requirement as follows:

- 2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 11-15, drawn to a method of making an extruded tube, classified in class 156, subclass 244.11.
 - II. Claims 6 and 10, drawn to an irrigation hose, classified in class 239, subclass 542.
 - III Claims 9, 16, and 17, drawn to a method of making a continuous strip, classified in class 264, subclass 165.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 3. Inventions Group I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product of the irrigation hose of Group II can be made by any processes other than extruding.
- 4. Inventions Group I and III are related as combination and subcombination.

 Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for

Application/Control Number: 10/749,141

Page 3

Art Unit: 3752

patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the method of making an extruded tube of Group I does not required the details of accumulating and storing the continuous strip of Group II. The subcombination has separate utility such as a continuous strip for use other than for irrigation purposes.

- 5. Inventions Group III and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the irrigation hose of Group II can be made by methods other than the method of Group III.
- 6. The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Art Unit: 3752

7. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election

Art Unit: 3752

shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

8. Furthermore, if Group I, II or III is elected, this application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species

Species I, Figures 2-4

Species II, Figures 5-8

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, it appears that claim 10 is generic.

Page 6

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are

Page 7

added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dinh Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4907. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Len Tran can be reached on 571-272-1184. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3752

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dinh Q Nguyen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3752

dgn